

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/677,502	10/02/2000	Yoshio Hashibe	0694-134	4484
75	90 07/08/2002			
Hopgood Calimafde			EXAMINER	
60 East 42nd Street New York, NY 10165			SERGENT, RABON A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711 DATE MAILED: 07/08/2002	10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TZ-10

...

Application No. 09/677,502

Applicant(s)

Hashibe et al.

Advisory Action

Examiner Rabon Sergent

Art Unit 1711

	The MAILING DATE Of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Ther reject allov	REPLY FILED Jun 7, 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. refore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final ction under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for vance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
	THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]
a)	$\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ The period for reply expires <u>five</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
e a s	xtensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate xtension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The ppropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply original at in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the nailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. 🗆	37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. 🗆	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a)	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
	they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the
,0,	issues for appeal; and/or
(d)	they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE: sound. Lastly, independent claim 9 has not been amended in accordance with the arguments.
	10 12. Sound. Lastry, independent claim 3 has not been amended in accordance with the arguments.
3.□	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
3. 🗆	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
<b>3</b> . □ <b>4</b> . □	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
_	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) \overline{\text{X}} request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Firstly, it has not been shown that the disclosed films, which are of the same materials and have overlapping
4. 🗆	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Firstly, it has not been shown that the disclosed films, which are of the same materials and have overlapping thicknesses, do not have the claimed reflectance values. Secondly, applicants refer to the properties (See 'Other')
4. 🗆	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) \overline{\text{X}} request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Firstly, it has not been shown that the disclosed films, which are of the same materials and have overlapping
4. □ 5. ⊠	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) \overline{\mathbb{X}} request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Firstly, it has not been shown that the disclosed films, which are of the same materials and have overlapping thicknesses, do not have the claimed reflectance values. Secondly, applicants refer to the properties (See 'Other')  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) □ affidavit, b) □ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Firstly, it has not been shown that the disclosed films, which are of the same materials and have overlapping thicknesses, do not have the claimed reflectance values. Secondly, applicants refer to the properties (See 'Other')  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) □ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) □ affidavit, b) □ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Firstly, it has not been shown that the disclosed films, which are of the same materials and have overlapping thicknesses, do not have the claimed reflectance values. Secondly, applicants refer to the properties (See 'Other')  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) □ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s)
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s)
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) \overline{\timestar} request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Firstly, it has not been shown that the disclosed films, which are of the same materials and have overlapping thicknesses, do not have the claimed reflectance values. Secondly, applicants refer to the properties (See 'Other')  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) \overline{\times} will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed: O
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s)
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □ 7. ☒	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Firstly, it has not been shown that the disclosed films, which are of the same materials and have overlapping thicknesses, do not have the claimed reflectance values. Secondly, applicants refer to the properties (See 'Other')  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed: O  Claim(s) objected to: O  Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6, and 8-10  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: O
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □ 7. ☒	Newly proposed or amended claim(s)